

MPI-Ph/93-44
TUM-T31-44/93
July 1993

The Rare Decays $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ and $K_L \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ Beyond Leading Logarithms*

GERHARD BUCHALLA and ANDRZEJ J. BURAS

Max-Planck-Institut für Physik
– *Werner-Heisenberg-Institut* –
P.O.Box 40 12 12, Munich, Germany

Technische Universität München, Physik Department
D-85748 Garching, Germany

Abstract

We analyze the branching ratio for the FCNC mode $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ in the standard model with QCD effects taken into account consistently to next-to-leading order. This involves a two-loop renormalization group analysis for the charm contribution, presented in this paper, and the calculation of $O(\alpha_s)$ corrections to all orders in m_t/M_W for the top-quark case that we have described elsewhere. The inclusion of next-to-leading corrections reduces considerably the theoretical uncertainty due to the choice of the renormalization scales, inherent in any calculation to finite order in perturbation theory. For $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ this point has not been discussed previously. In particular, the related uncertainty in the determination of $|V_{td}|$ from $B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})$ is reduced from $\sim 30\%$ to $\sim 7\%$ for typical values of the parameters. Simultaneously also the dependence of $B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})$ on the choice of m_c is considerably reduced. We also give the next-to-leading order expression for the short-distance part of $K_L \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$. Impacts of our calculations on the determination of the unitarity triangle are presented.

*Supported by the German Bundesministerium für Forschung und Technologie under contract 06 TM 732 and by the CEC science project SC1-CT91-0729.

1 Introduction

The rare decay mode $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ is one of the most interesting and promising processes in the rich field of rare decay phenomenology [1, 2] and has already received considerable attention in the past [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8]. The main reasons for this interest may be summarized as follows:

$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ is a "clean" process from the theoretical point of view:

- It is short-distance (SD) dominated. Possible long-distance contributions have been considered in [9, 10] and found to be negligibly small (three orders of magnitude smaller than the SD contribution at the level of branching ratios).
- Being a semi-leptonic process, the relevant hadronic operator is just a current operator whose matrix element can be extracted from the leading decay $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 e^+ \nu$.

Consequently this decay can be reliably treated by the available field theoretical methods.

The effective low-energy interaction mediating $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ is a flavor-changing neutral current (FCNC). While being forbidden at the tree level, FCNC's can be induced through loops containing virtual heavy quarks. Therefore $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$

- probes the standard model at the quantum level, thereby allowing for an indirect test of high energy scales through a low energy process,
- is sensitive to the unknown top quark mass m_t and
- depends on the top quark couplings V_{ts} and V_{td} .

Thus combined theoretical and experimental efforts may yield very desirable information on parameters of the symmetry breaking sector in the standard model – the part of the theory least understood theoretically and containing the least known parameters such as the top mass and its CKM couplings. In particular it should be stressed that $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ is probably the cleanest process to search for V_{td} .

The $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ mode has not yet been observed experimentally. The published upper bound on the branching ratio is [11]

$$B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})_{exp} \leq 3.4 \cdot 10^{-8} \quad (1)$$

A preliminary result from E787 at Brookhaven [12] gives an improved value of

$$B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})_{exp} \leq 5 \cdot 10^{-9} \quad (2)$$

which is still well above the theoretical expectation of $O(10^{-10})$, but a considerable improvement is expected from upgrades planned for the coming years and designed to reach the 10^{-10} level [13].

After these general introductory remarks let us now turn to a more detailed discussion of the basic structure of the physics underlying $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$. The low energy effective hamiltonian relevant for the process $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ may be written as follows

$$\mathcal{H}_{eff} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\alpha}{2\pi \sin^2 \Theta_W} \sum_{i=c,t} V_{is}^* V_{id} X(x_i) (\bar{s}d)_{V-A} (\bar{\nu}\nu)_{V-A} \quad (3)$$

where $x_i = m_i^2/M_W^2$ and $X(x)$ is a monotonically increasing function of x to be given below. This hamiltonian consists of two parts: a top-quark and a charm-quark contribution, which originate to lowest order in the standard model from the Z-penguin- and box-diagrams shown in fig.1. By writing the hamiltonian in this form, the GIM mechanism is already incorporated and the up-quark contribution is understood to be subtracted from top- and charm-loops. In particular then $X(x)$ has the property $X(0) = 0$.

It is a characteristic feature of the $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ decay amplitude that both top and charm contributions are of comparable size, since the smallness of $X(x_c)$ in comparison to $X(x_t)$ (due to $m_c \ll m_t$) is compensated by the strong CKM suppression of the top contribution. By contrast this suppression is absent e.g. for the CP-violating mode $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$, where the branching ratio is determined by the imaginary part of the amplitude, or for rare B-decays such as $B \rightarrow X_s \nu \bar{\nu}$ and $B \rightarrow l^+ l^-$. Therefore the charm contribution is completely negligible in these latter processes.

The short-distance electroweak loops of fig.1 receive calculable radiative corrections through gluon exchange. Until recently these QCD corrections have been known only to leading logarithmic (LLA) accuracy [4, 5, 6]. In this approximation the charm contribution to the $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ amplitude is reduced by about 35% through QCD effects. Since due to $m_t = O(M_W)$ no large logs are present in the top contribution, this part remains uncorrected in LLA. As a consequence a non-negligible theoretical uncertainty remains due to the choice of the arbitrary

renormalization scale μ at which the top mass $m_t(\mu)$ is defined. Although the effect of varying μ around values of $O(m_t)$ is formally of the neglected order $O(\alpha_s)$, it amounts numerically to an uncertainty of 20%–30% for branching ratios. This issue has been discussed in detail in our previous papers [14, 15] where we have calculated the complete $O(\alpha_s)$ corrections to the top contribution for a class of rare decays governed by Z-penguin- and box-diagrams. This allowed us to give improved expressions, including the $O(\alpha_s)$ corrections, for the branching ratios of those decays that are top-quark dominated ($K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$, $B \rightarrow X_s \nu \bar{\nu}$, $B \rightarrow l^+ l^-$) and to show that the scale ambiguities in the branching ratios are thus reduced from $O(25\%)$ to typically $O(3\%)$.

The main objective of the present study is to perform a complete renormalization group analysis of the charm contribution to $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ in the next-to-leading logarithmic approximation (NLLA). Going beyond LLA is mandatory for consistency with the QCD corrected top-quark contribution. Furthermore it will decrease considerable theoretical uncertainties due to the choice of $\mu = O(m_c)$ present also in the charm sector. The remaining uncertainties will however be bigger than the ones in the top-sector due to the smaller scales involved at which $\alpha_s(\mu)$ is larger and QCD perturbation theory less accurate. Combining the result with the QCD corrected top contribution from [15] will provide us with the final theoretical expression for $B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})$ which includes the short-distance QCD effects consistently at the next-to-leading-log level.

At this stage we would like to recall the strong dependence of $B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})$ on the choice of m_c as emphasized in particular by Dib [7] and by Harris and Rosner [8]. These authors varying m_c in the range $1.2\text{GeV} \leq m_c \leq 1.8\text{GeV}$ have found a 40-50% uncertainty in $B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})$ which is clearly disturbing. This large range for m_c chosen in [7, 8] is at first sight surprising because in a decay like $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ the presence of the charm quark is only felt in the short distance loop and consequently it is evident that for m_c the current quark mass value should be used. For the latter however one has $m_c(m_c) = 1.3 \pm 0.1\text{GeV}$ [16, 17]. On the other hand there is an ambiguity in the choice of the scale in m_c and the use of $m_c(\mu)$ with $\mu = O(m_c)$ in the calculation of $B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})$ is perfectly legitimate. With $m_c(m_c)$ given above and $1\text{GeV} \leq \mu \leq 3\text{GeV}$ one effectively ends up with a range for $m_c(\mu)$ very similar to the one chosen for m_c in

[7, 8]. Consequently if one uses the leading order expressions as done in [7, 8], the uncertainty due to the treatment of m_c is quite substantial. One of the important results of the present analysis is that the inclusion of next-to-leading corrections reduces considerably the uncertainty due to m_c stressed in [7, 8].

In order to further motivate the present calculation it is instructive to recall the relevant formulae for the top contribution [15] and discuss their implications for the charm case. The function $X(x)$ in (3) is to $O(\alpha_s)$ and without approximation in m/M_W given by eqs. (8)–(11). In the case of charm ($x_c \approx 3 \cdot 10^{-4} \ll 1$) it is not necessary to keep all orders in m/M_W . We will restrict ourselves to keeping only terms linear in x , neglecting the order $O(x^2)$, which is an excellent approximation. Indeed in this case one can write the function X from (8) with an error of less than 0.1% as ($\mu = m_c$; $a \equiv \alpha_s/4\pi$)

$$X(x) \doteq -\frac{3}{4}x \ln x - \frac{1}{4}x + a \left(-2x \ln^2 x - 7x \ln x - \frac{23 + 2\pi^2}{3}x \right) \quad (4)$$

It is instructive to take a closer look at the numerical values of the five terms in (4). For typical values $m_c = 1.3\text{GeV}$, $\Lambda_{QCD} = 0.25\text{GeV}$ these five terms read

$$X(x) = (16.32 - 0.66 - 13.05 + 5.54 - 1.37) \cdot 10^{-4} = 6.78 \cdot 10^{-4} \quad (5)$$

Several lessons can already be learned from this simple exercise:

- One can see very clearly that straightforward perturbation theory is not reliable in this case as the $O(a)$ correction amounts to more than 50% of the lowest order result.
- A renormalization group treatment is therefore mandatory. The LLA consists in summing the first and third terms in (4), (5) and similar terms $O(xa^n \ln^{n+1} x)$ to all orders in perturbation theory.
- However the fourth term, neglected in LLA, is still quite sizeable. We can see explicitly that a next-to-leading log summation is very desirable: it resums all the terms of $O(xa^n \ln^n x)$, in particular the second and the fourth term above.
- The non-leading mass term in the lowest order expression ($-\frac{1}{4}x$) is consistently taken into account within NLLA.

- The suppression of the charm contribution by leading-log QCD corrections is reflected in the negative sign of the $O(ax \ln^2 x)$ correction term. The positive next-to-leading log contribution indicates that this suppression tends to be weakened in NLLA. This will be confirmed by the exact result discussed in section 5.
- The last term above is formally of the order $O(ax)$ and therefore neglected even in NLLA. Unfortunately it has a relatively large coefficient and gives roughly a 10% contribution. This number gives a hint on the remaining uncertainty to be expected.

It is evident from this discussion that, given the high interest in the rare decay mode $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ and considering the theoretical situation, it is worthwhile to perform the full next-to-leading order analysis in order to be able to reduce disturbing theoretical uncertainties.

Our paper is organized as follows. Section 2 briefly collects some of the most important results. In sections 3 and 4 we will describe in some detail the formalism necessary for the two-loop renormalization group calculation in the charm sector for the Z-penguin- and the box-part respectively. In section 5 the results will be combined and the implications regarding the size of the corrections and the dependence on the renormalization scale will be investigated. In section 6 we combine both charm and top contributions and discuss phenomenological consequences for $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$. In particular we address the determination of V_{td} from this decay and we discuss the implications of our calculations for the unitarity triangle. The calculation of next-to-leading order corrections to the decay $K_L \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ is very similar to $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ and will be presented in section 7 for completeness. Unfortunately, due to insufficiently known long distance contributions this decay is less useful for the determination of CKM parameters. We end our paper with a brief summary of the main results.

2 The Main Formulae of this Paper

Before entering the detailed discussion we find it useful to collect in this section the most important results of the present paper.

First of all, the complete effective hamiltonian relevant for $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ can be

written as

$$\mathcal{H}_{eff} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\alpha}{2\pi \sin^2 \Theta_W} \sum_{l=e,\mu,\tau} \left(V_{cs}^* V_{cd} X_{NL}^l + V_{ts}^* V_{td} X(x_t) \right) (\bar{s}d)_{V-A} (\bar{\nu}_l \nu_l)_{V-A} \quad (6)$$

The $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ branching ratio obtained from (6) is, for one single neutrino flavor, given by

$$B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu_l \bar{\nu}_l) = \frac{\alpha^2 B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 e^+ \nu)}{V_{us}^2 2\pi^2 \sin^4 \Theta_W} \left| V_{cs}^* V_{cd} X_{NL}^l + V_{ts}^* V_{td} X(x_t) \right|^2 \quad (7)$$

Here index l ($l=e, \mu, \tau$) denotes the lepton flavor. The lepton mass dependence in the top-quark sector can be neglected. The function $X(x)$, relevant for the top contribution, is to $O(\alpha_s)$ and to all orders in m/M_W given by ($a \equiv \alpha_s/4\pi$)

$$X(x) = X_0(x) + aX_1(x) \quad (8)$$

with [3]

$$X_0(x) = \frac{x}{8} \left[-\frac{2+x}{1-x} + \frac{3x-6}{(1-x)^2} \ln x \right] \quad (9)$$

and the QCD correction [14, 15]

$$\begin{aligned} X_1(x) = & - \frac{23x + 5x^2 - 4x^3}{3(1-x)^2} + \frac{x - 11x^2 + x^3 + x^4}{(1-x)^3} \ln x \\ & + \frac{8x + 4x^2 + x^3 - x^4}{2(1-x)^3} \ln^2 x - \frac{4x - x^3}{(1-x)^2} L_2(1-x) \\ & + 8x \frac{\partial X_0(x)}{\partial x} \ln x_\mu \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where $x_\mu = \mu^2/M_W^2$ with $\mu = O(m_t)$ and

$$L_2(1-x) = \int_1^x dt \frac{\ln t}{1-t} \quad (11)$$

The μ -dependence in the last term in (10) cancels to the order considered the μ -dependence of the leading term $X_0(x(\mu))$. The corresponding expression for the charm sector is the function X_{NL}^l . It results from the RG calculation in NLLA and reads as follows:

$$X_{NL}^l = C_{NL} - 4B_{NL}^{(1/2)} \quad (12)$$

$$\begin{aligned} C_{NL} = & \frac{x(m)}{32} K_c^{\frac{24}{25}} \left[\left(\frac{48}{7} K_+ + \frac{24}{11} K_- - \frac{696}{77} K_{33} \right) \left(\frac{1}{a(\mu)} + \frac{15212}{1875} (1 - K_c^{-1}) \right) \right. \\ & + \left(1 - \ln \frac{\mu^2}{m^2} \right) (16K_+ - 8K_-) - \frac{1176244}{13125} K_+ - \frac{2302}{6875} K_- + \frac{3529184}{48125} K_{33} \\ & \left. + K \left(\frac{56248}{4375} K_+ - \frac{81448}{6875} K_- + \frac{4563698}{144375} K_{33} \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where

$$K = \frac{a(M_W)}{a(\mu)} \quad K_c = \frac{a(\mu)}{a(m)} \quad (14)$$

$$K_+ = K^{\frac{6}{25}} \quad K_- = K^{\frac{-12}{25}} \quad K_{33} = K^{\frac{-1}{25}} \quad (15)$$

$$B_{NL}^{(1/2)} = \frac{x(m)}{4} K_c^{\frac{24}{25}} \left[3(1 - K_2) \left(\frac{1}{a(\mu)} + \frac{15212}{1875} (1 - K_c^{-1}) \right) - \ln \frac{\mu^2}{m^2} - \frac{r \ln r}{1 - r} - \frac{305}{12} + \frac{15212}{625} K_2 + \frac{15581}{7500} K K_2 \right] \quad (16)$$

Here $K_2 = K^{-1/25}$, $m = m_c$, $r = m_l^2/m_c^2$ and m_l is the lepton mass. We will at times omit the index l of X_{NL}^l . In (13) – (16) the scale $\mu = O(m_c)$. The two-loop expression for $a(\mu)$ is given in (44). Again – to the considered order – the explicit $\ln(\mu^2/m^2)$ terms in (13) and (16) cancel the μ -dependence of the leading terms. Expressing CKM elements through the Wolfenstein parameters λ , A , ϱ and η with $\lambda = 0.22$ and summing over the three neutrino flavors we finally find

$$B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}) = 4.62 \cdot 10^{-11} A^4 X^2(x_t) \left[\eta^2 + \frac{2}{3} (\varrho_o^e - \varrho)^2 + \frac{1}{3} (\varrho_o^{\tau} - \varrho)^2 \right] \quad (17)$$

where

$$\varrho_o^l = 1 + \frac{417}{A^2} \frac{X_{NL}^l}{X(x_t)} \quad (18)$$

Formula (17) together with $X(x_t)$ and X_{NL}^l given in (8) and (12) respectively gives $B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})$ in the standard model with QCD effects taken into account consistently to next-to-leading order. The leading order expressions are obtained by replacing $X(x_t) \rightarrow X_0(x_t)$ and $X_{NL}^l \rightarrow X_L$ with X_L found from (13) and (16) by retaining there only the $1/a(\mu)$ terms. In LLA the one-loop expression should be used for α_s . This amounts to setting $\beta_1 = 0$ in (44). A numerical analysis of (17) and (18) together with related issues will be presented in section 6. Numerical values of X_{NL}^l can be found in section 5.

3 RG Calculation for the Z-Penguin Contribution

In the present section we will outline the basic formalism needed to perform the renormalization group analysis to next-to-leading order in the charm sector of the decay $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$. We start our discussion with the Z-penguin contribution

which is slightly more complicated than the box contribution. Having derived the former, which can be done in closed form, it will be straightforward to obtain the expression for the box contribution in the next section.

The calculation consists of the following three steps:

- In the first step the W and Z bosons being much heavier than the charm-quark are integrated out and the resulting effective hamiltonian is written down with matching conditions set up at $\mu = M_W$.
- The renormalization and mixing of the operators contributing to the $\bar{s}d \rightarrow \bar{\nu}\nu$ transition amplitude is calculated to two-loop order. The corresponding renormalization group equation is solved and the scale μ is evolved down to lower values.
- At a scale $\mu = O(m_c)$ the charm quark as an explicit degree of freedom is removed from the effective theory. The only remaining operator is $(\bar{s}d)_{V-A}(\bar{\nu}\nu)_{V-A}$. Its coefficient yields the generalization in NLLA of the charm penguin contribution to $X(x_c)$. Since this operator has no anomalous dimension, no renormalization group running occurs below scales of $O(m_c)$ and the contributing QCD corrections are entirely perturbative.

For the actual calculations we took external quarks massless and on-shell, which is the most convenient possibility. Since we are computing the short distance coefficients of an operator product expansion, the treatment of external lines is arbitrary and the final result does not depend on this choice. Furthermore we used dimensional regularization for both UV- and IR-divergences. We have employed Feynman gauge for the gluon and the W-boson field throughout the present work.

3.1 Step 1

After the W and Z bosons have been integrated out, the effective hamiltonian responsible for the Z-penguin contribution may be written as ($\lambda_c = V_{cs}^* V_{cd}$)

$$\mathcal{H}_{eff,c}^{(Z)} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\alpha}{2\pi \sin^2 \Theta_W} \lambda_c \frac{\pi^2}{2M_W^2} (v_+ O_+ + v_- O_- + v_3 Q) \quad (19)$$

where the operator basis is

$$O_1 = -i \int d^4x \, T((\bar{s}_i c_j)_{V-A} (\bar{c}_j d_i)_{V-A})(x) ((\bar{c}_k c_k)_{V-A} (\bar{\nu} \nu)_{V-A})(0) - \{c \rightarrow u\} \quad (20)$$

$$O_2 = -i \int d^4x \, T((\bar{s}_i c_i)_{V-A} (\bar{c}_j d_j)_{V-A})(x) ((\bar{c}_k c_k)_{V-A} (\bar{\nu} \nu)_{V-A})(0) - \{c \rightarrow u\} \quad (21)$$

$$O_{\pm} = \frac{1}{2}(O_2 \pm O_1) \quad (22)$$

$$Q = \frac{m^2}{g^2} (\bar{s} d)_{V-A} (\bar{\nu} \nu)_{V-A} \quad (23)$$

For convenience we have introduced the bilocal structures $O_{1,2}$, which contain the relevant local 4-fermion operators in a form suitable for the evaluation of the $\bar{s}d \rightarrow \bar{\nu}\nu$ transition amplitude. Furthermore we have switched to the diagonal basis $O_{\pm}$, anticipating the QCD renormalization and we have included a factor m^2/g^2 (where m is the (charm-) quark mass and g the strong coupling constant) in the definition of Q in order to streamline the notation for the anomalous dimension matrices to be discussed below.

As the first step we have to find the Wilson coefficients at M_W to next-to-leading order. These can be written as follows ($\vec{v}^T \equiv (v_+, v_-, v_3)$)

$$\vec{v}(M_W) = \vec{v}^{(0)} + a(M_W) \vec{v}^{(1)} \quad (24)$$

$$\vec{v}^{(0)T} = (1, 1, 0) \quad (25)$$

$$\vec{v}^{(1)T} = (B_+, B_-, B_3) \quad (26)$$

In the NDR-scheme ($\overline{MS}$, anticommuting γ_5 in $D \neq 4$ dimensions) one gets

$$B_{\pm} = \pm 11 \frac{N \mp 1}{2N} \quad B_3 = 16 \quad (27)$$

where N is the number of colors. The calculation of the scheme dependent next-to-leading order terms $B_{\pm}$ has been discussed in detail in [18]. The value of B_3 as well as the zero entry in (25) follows from matching the $\bar{s}d \rightarrow \bar{\nu}\nu$ amplitude calculated in the effective theory (19) onto the amplitude in the full theory to $O(a)$ at $\mu = M_W$. To this end the renormalized matrix elements of the operators $O_{\pm}$ are needed. They correspond to the diagram of fig.2 and read in the NDR-scheme

$$\langle O_{\pm} \rangle = a(\mu) \frac{1}{2} \gamma_{\pm 3}^{(0)} \left(1 - \ln \frac{\mu^2}{m^2} \right) \langle Q \rangle \quad (28)$$

with $\gamma_{\pm 3}^{(0)}$ given in (47). Using (28) and comparing the matrix element of (19) with the amplitude in the full theory

$$A_c^{(Z)} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\alpha}{2\pi \sin^2 \Theta_W} \lambda_c \left(\frac{x}{4} \ln x + \frac{3}{4}x \right) (\bar{s}d)_{V-A} (\bar{\nu}\nu)_{V-A} \quad (29)$$

gives the value of B_3 quoted in (27). The amplitude $A_c^{(Z)}$ follows simply from the evaluation of the Z^o -penguin diagrams of fig.1 in the limit $x \ll 1$.

3.2 Step 2

In the next step we have to discuss the renormalization group evolution. The anomalous dimensions for $O_{\pm}$, to be denoted by $\gamma_{\pm}$, are known to two-loop order and have been calculated in [18, 19] in various renormalization schemes. Here we use the NDR result of [18]. The anomalous dimension of Q , denoted by γ_{33} , is also known to the same order. It depends only on the anomalous dimensions of the mass and the coupling constant as is evident from the definition (23). What remains is the mixing of $O_{\pm}$ to Q ($\gamma_{\pm 3}$). The corresponding elements of the anomalous dimension matrix are obtained as usual from the divergent parts of the diagrams in figs. 2 and 3. The one-loop mixing has been considered in [4, 5, 6]. The two-loop case required for the present investigation is calculated in the present work and the results will be given below. In short, the anomalous dimension matrix has in the operator basis $\{O_+, O_-, Q\}$ the general form

$$\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_+ & 0 & \gamma_{+3} \\ 0 & \gamma_- & \gamma_{-3} \\ 0 & 0 & \gamma_{33} \end{pmatrix} \quad (30)$$

It governs the evolution of the Wilson coefficient functions by means of the renormalization group equation

$$\frac{d}{d \ln \mu} \vec{v} = \gamma^T \vec{v} \quad (31)$$

Note in particular that the evolution of $v_{\pm}$ is unaffected by the presence of Q . To proceed we briefly recall the general method for the solution of the renormalization group equation (31) in next-to-leading order, which we find useful also for the special case at hand. We follow [20].

The anomalous dimensions of the operators $\{O_{\pm}, Q\}$, γ , and of the coupling constant, $\beta(g)/g$, are in second order of perturbation theory

$$\gamma(a) = a\gamma^{(0)} + a^2\gamma^{(1)} \quad (32)$$

$$\beta(g)/g = -a\beta_0 - a^2\beta_1 \quad (33)$$

We also need the anomalous dimension of the mass

$$\frac{dm}{d \ln \mu} = -\gamma_m m \quad (34)$$

$$\gamma_m(a) = a\gamma_{m0} + a^2\gamma_{m1} \quad (35)$$

The solution of (31) can be expressed in terms of an evolution matrix $U(\mu, M_W)$ as

$$\vec{v}(\mu) = U(\mu, M_W)\vec{v}(M_W) \quad (36)$$

$$U(\mu, M_W) = [1 + a(\mu)J]U^{(0)}(\mu, M_W)[1 - a(M_W)J] \quad (37)$$

$U^{(0)}$ is the evolution matrix in leading logarithmic approximation:

$$U^{(0)}(\mu, M_W) = V \left(\left[\frac{a(M_W)}{a(\mu)} \right]^{\frac{\vec{\gamma}^{(0)}}{2\beta_0}} \right)_D V^{-1} \quad (38)$$

where V diagonalizes $\gamma^{(0)T}$

$$\gamma_D^{(0)} = V^{-1}\gamma^{(0)T}V \quad (39)$$

and $\vec{\gamma}^{(0)}$ is the vector containing the diagonal elements of the diagonal matrix $\gamma_D^{(0)}$.

Defining now

$$G = V^{-1}\gamma^{(1)T}V \quad (40)$$

and a matrix S whose elements are

$$S_{ij} = \delta_{ij}\gamma_i^{(0)} \frac{\beta_1}{2\beta_0^2} - \frac{G_{ij}}{2\beta_0 + \gamma_i^{(0)} - \gamma_j^{(0)}} \quad (41)$$

the matrix J is given by

$$J = VSV^{-1} \quad (42)$$

In our case the 3×3 matrix J has the structure

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} J_{11} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & J_{22} & 0 \\ J_{31} & J_{32} & J_{33} \end{pmatrix} \quad (43)$$

similar to γ^T in (30).

We will now collect various expressions which enter the renormalization group

functions discussed above.

For the QCD coupling in NLLA we use the form

$$a(\mu) = \frac{1}{\beta_0 \ln \frac{\mu^2}{\Lambda^2}} \left[1 - \frac{\beta_1}{\beta_0^2} \frac{\ln \ln \frac{\mu^2}{\Lambda^2}}{\ln \frac{\mu^2}{\Lambda^2}} \right] \quad (44)$$

where $\Lambda \equiv \Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}$. The parameters of the β -function and of the anomalous dimension of the mass are (with $N(f)$ the number of colors (flavors))

$$\beta_0 = \frac{11N - 2f}{3} \quad \beta_1 = \frac{34}{3}N^2 - \frac{10}{3}Nf - 2C_F f \quad C_F = \frac{N^2 - 1}{2N} \quad (45)$$

$$\gamma_{m0} = 6C_F \quad \gamma_{m1} = C_F \left(3C_F + \frac{97}{3}N - \frac{10}{3}f \right) \quad (46)$$

The nonvanishing elements of the anomalous dimension matrix read

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{33}^{(0)} &= 2(\gamma_{m0} - \beta_0) & \gamma_{33}^{(1)} &= 2(\gamma_{m1} - \beta_1) \\ \gamma_{\pm}^{(0)} &= \pm 6 \frac{N \mp 1}{N} & \gamma_{\pm}^{(1)} &= \frac{N \mp 1}{2N} \left(-21 \pm \frac{57}{N} \mp \frac{19}{3}N \pm \frac{4}{3}f \right) \\ \gamma_{\pm 3}^{(0)} &= \pm 8(N \pm 1) & \gamma_{\pm 3}^{(1)} &= C_F(\pm 88N - 48) \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

The expressions $\gamma^{(1)}$ are in the NDR-scheme. The matrix V in (39) is

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ V_{31} & V_{32} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (48)$$

$$V_{31} = \frac{\gamma_{+3}^{(0)}}{\gamma_{+}^{(0)} - \gamma_{33}^{(0)}} \quad V_{32} = \frac{\gamma_{-3}^{(0)}}{\gamma_{-}^{(0)} - \gamma_{33}^{(0)}} \quad (49)$$

Furthermore we define (see (14))

$$K_i = K^{\frac{\gamma_i^{(0)}}{2\beta_0}} \quad i = +, -, 33 \quad (50)$$

With all these formulae at hand we are now able to obtain the coefficients $\vec{v}$ at scales $\mu \ll M_W$ by means of (36). We find

$$v_{\pm}(\mu) = [1 + a(\mu)J_{\pm}] K_{\pm} [1 - a(M_W)(J_{\pm} - B_{\pm})] \quad (51)$$

where $J_{+} \equiv J_{11}$, $J_{-} \equiv J_{22}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} v_3(\mu) &= V_{31}(K_{+} - K_{33}) + V_{32}(K_{-} - K_{33}) \\ &+ a(\mu) [(J_{31} + J_{33}V_{31})K_{+} + (J_{32} + J_{33}V_{32})K_{-} - J_{33}(V_{31} + V_{32})K_{33}] \\ &+ a(M_W) [(B_{+} - J_{11})V_{31}K_{+} + (B_{-} - J_{22})V_{32}K_{-} \\ &+ (B_3 - J_{31} - J_{32} + (J_{11} - B_{+})V_{31} + (J_{22} - B_{-})V_{32})K_{33}] \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

3.3 Step 3

The last step consists in integrating out the charm-quark. This is done by matching the effective theory in (19) onto an effective theory without the operators $O_{\pm}$ at a scale $\mu = O(m_c)$. Below this scale the hamiltonian involves the single operator Q . The effects of the charm field being removed from the theory as an explicitly appearing degree of freedom are then still indirectly present in the modified coefficient of Q . Effectively this step is accomplished by inserting $\langle O_{\pm} \rangle$ of (28) into (19).

3.4 Final Result for the Z-Penguin

Collecting the results of the three steps and using (19) we obtain the final expression in NLLA for the charm contribution to the Z-penguin part of the effective hamiltonian, suitable for scales below $\mu = O(m_c)$:

$$\mathcal{H}_{eff,c}^{(Z)} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\alpha}{2\pi \sin^2 \Theta_W} \lambda_c C_{NL} (\bar{s}d)_{V-A} (\bar{\nu}\nu)_{V-A} \quad (53)$$

$$C_{NL} = \frac{x(\mu)}{32} \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \ln \frac{\mu^2}{m^2} \right) \left(\gamma_{+3}^{(0)} K_+ + \gamma_{-3}^{(0)} K_- \right) + \frac{v_3(\mu)}{a(\mu)} \right] \quad (54)$$

To the order considered the terms of $O(a)$ in $v_{\pm}(\mu)$ have to be dropped. C_{NL} is the generalization of the lowest order function $C_0(x)$ (see (55)) that includes the QCD corrections in NLLA. In fact

$$\lim_{\Lambda \rightarrow 0} C_{NL} = \frac{x}{4} \ln x + \frac{3}{4}x \doteq C_0(x) \quad (55)$$

We will discuss this result in more detail later on.

It is useful to express the running charm quark mass $m(\mu)$ in terms of $m(m)$, which we use as an input parameter:

$$x(\mu) = x(m) \left[\frac{a(\mu)}{a(m)} \right]^{\frac{\gamma_{m0}}{\beta_0}} \left[1 + \left(\frac{\gamma_{m1}}{\beta_0} - \frac{\beta_1 \gamma_{m0}}{\beta_0^2} \right) (a(\mu) - a(m)) \right] \quad (56)$$

Setting $N = 3$ and $f = 4$ in (54) we then obtain formula (13) quoted in section 2.

We have performed the renormalization group evolution in an effective four-flavor theory from scales of $O(M_W)$ down to $O(m_c)$ and neglected the effects of a b-quark threshold and a corresponding five-flavor theory above m_b . This is an

excellent approximation which allows one to write down a fairly compact final result in closed form. We have checked that the inclusion of a b-quark threshold would change the values for the charm-quark function X_{NL} by not more than 0.1%.

3.5 Renormalization Scheme Independence

To conclude this section we turn to the question of renormalization scheme dependences and their cancellation. This issue is well known and has already been discussed elsewhere (see e.g. [20]). However since the application of the next-to-leading renormalization group formalism to the case considered here is new and the explicit expression of C_{NL} clearly involves scheme dependences whose cancellation may not be entirely obvious from (52), we find it useful to give a short account of this subject in explicit terms.

In essence the scheme independence of a matrix element of the effective hamiltonian (19) is trivial since it is proportional to

$$\langle \vec{O}^T(\mu) \rangle \vec{v}(\mu) = \langle v_+ O_+ + v_- O_- + v_3 Q \rangle|_\mu \quad (57)$$

which is manifestly scheme independent. Different choices of the scheme just shift finite $O(a)$ -terms between the coefficients and the operator matrix elements—this freedom is in fact the reason why the unphysical coefficients are scheme dependent. More explicitly these quantities are in different schemes related by

$$\langle \vec{O} \rangle' = (1 - as) \langle \vec{O} \rangle \quad \vec{v}' = (1 + as^T) \vec{v} \quad (58)$$

where s is a constant 3×3 matrix of the form

$$s = \begin{pmatrix} s_+ & 0 & s_{+3} \\ 0 & s_- & s_{-3} \\ 0 & 0 & s_3 \end{pmatrix} \quad (59)$$

Since

$$\langle \vec{O}^T(\mu) \rangle \vec{v}(\mu) \equiv \langle \vec{O}^T(\mu) \rangle U(\mu, M_W) \vec{v}(M_W) \quad (60)$$

implies

$$U'(\mu, M_W) = (1 + a(\mu)s^T)U(\mu, M_W)(1 - a(M_W)s^T) \quad (61)$$

we have from (37)

$$J' = J + s^T \quad (62)$$

If we use the relation between J and $\gamma^{(1)}$ (from (40) - (42))

$$J + \left[\frac{\gamma^{(0)T}}{2\beta_0}, J \right] = -\frac{\gamma^{(1)T}}{2\beta_0} + \frac{\beta_1}{2\beta_0^2} \gamma^{(0)T} \quad (63)$$

we obtain the transformation property of the anomalous dimensions under a change in the renormalization scheme:

$$\gamma^{(1)'} = \gamma^{(1)} - [s, \gamma^{(0)}] - 2\beta_0 s \quad \gamma^{(0)'} = \gamma^{(0)} \quad (64)$$

Given these general formulae one can easily clarify the cancellation of scheme dependences in all particular cases or convert scheme dependent quantities from one scheme to another, if desired. To be more specific, let us consider expression (52). The first line being a function of one-loop anomalous dimensions and the coupling constant only is obviously scheme independent. The coefficient of $a(M_W)$ is scheme independent since the scheme dependences in J and B_i cancel in the combinations $B_+ - J_{11}$, $B_- - J_{22}$ and $B_3 - J_{31} - J_{32}$ ((26), (58) and (62)). The scheme dependences in the coefficient of $a(\mu)$ remain and are responsible for the scheme dependence of $v_3(\mu)$. We have, using (52), (62) and $\langle Q \rangle' = (1 - as_3)\langle Q \rangle$

$$v_3' \langle Q \rangle' = v_3 \langle Q \rangle + a(\mu)[s_{+3}K_+ + s_{-3}K_-] \langle Q \rangle \quad (65)$$

On the other hand, up to terms of the neglected order (note that $\langle O_{\pm} \rangle = O(a)$)

$$v_+' \langle O_+ \rangle' + v_-' \langle O_- \rangle' = v_+ \langle O_+ \rangle + v_- \langle O_- \rangle - a(\mu)[s_{+3}K_+ + s_{-3}K_-] \langle Q \rangle \quad (66)$$

Eq. (66) reflects the arbitrariness one has in the subtraction of finite constants when defining the renormalized matrix elements $\langle O_{\pm} \rangle$. The scheme dependences in (65) and (66) cancel in the sum, which essentially represents the function C_{NL} . The cancellation of the μ -dependence will be discussed in section 5.

4 RG Calculation for the Box Contribution

After the detailed exposition of the Z-penguin contribution in the preceding section it is straightforward to repeat the analysis in the analogous, but somewhat simpler case of the box. We will briefly summarize the essential steps.

4.1 Step 1

When the W boson is integrated out, the hamiltonian relevant for the box diagram is given by

$$\mathcal{H}_{eff,c}^{(B)} = -\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\alpha}{2\pi \sin^2 \Theta_W} \lambda_c \left(-\frac{\pi^2}{M_W^2} \right) (c_1 O + c_2 Q) \quad (67)$$

$$O = -i \int d^4x \, T((\bar{s}c)_{V-A}(\bar{\nu}l)_{V-A})(x) \, ((\bar{l}\nu)_{V-A}(\bar{c}d)_{V-A})(0) - \{c \rightarrow u\} \quad (68)$$

$$Q = \frac{m^2}{g^2} (\bar{s}d)_{V-A}(\bar{\nu}\nu)_{V-A} \quad (69)$$

In order to find the initial conditions for the coefficients c_i we need the renormalized matrix element of the operator O . Calculating the diagram of fig.4 we find in the NDR-scheme

$$\langle O \rangle = a(\mu) 16 \left(\ln \frac{\mu^2}{m^2} + \frac{5}{4} + \frac{r \ln r}{1-r} \right) \langle Q \rangle \quad (70)$$

Inserting this result into (67) and comparing with the amplitude in the full theory given by

$$A_c^{(B)} = -\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\alpha}{2\pi \sin^2 \Theta_W} \lambda_c \left(x \ln x + x \left(1 + \frac{r \ln r}{r-1} \right) \right) (\bar{s}d)_{V-A}(\bar{\nu}\nu)_{V-A} \quad (71)$$

implies the initial values for the Wilson coefficient function in the NDR-scheme

$$\vec{c}^T(M_W) \equiv (c_1(M_W), c_2(M_W)) = (1, 0) + a(M_W)(0, B_2) \quad B_2 = -36 \quad (72)$$

4.2 Step 2

The anomalous dimension matrix in the basis $\{O, Q\}$ has the form

$$\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \gamma_{12} \\ 0 & \gamma_{22} \end{pmatrix} \quad (73)$$

with the perturbative expansion

$$\gamma = a\gamma^{(0)} + a^2\gamma^{(1)} \quad (74)$$

The anomalous dimensions $\gamma_{12}^{(0)}$, $\gamma_{12}^{(1)}$, describing the RG mixing of operator O with Q follow from the divergent parts of the diagrams in fig.4 and fig.5 respectively. $\gamma_{12}^{(0)}$ has been calculated in [4, 5, 6]. $\gamma_{12}^{(1)}$ is new. The solution of the

renormalization group equation in NLLA is obtained via the general method described in section 3.

The matrix V needed to diagonalize $\gamma^{(0)T}$

$$V^{-1}\gamma^{(0)T}V = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_{22}^{(0)} \end{pmatrix} \quad (75)$$

is given by

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ V_{21} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad V_{21} = -\frac{\gamma_{12}^{(0)}}{\gamma_{22}^{(0)}} \quad (76)$$

Furthermore, the matrix J defined in (42) can in this case be written as

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ J_{21} & J_{22} \end{pmatrix} \quad (77)$$

The nonvanishing elements of the anomalous dimension matrix are

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{22}^{(0)} &= 2(\gamma_{m0} - \beta_0) & \gamma_{22}^{(1)} &= 2(\gamma_{m1} - \beta_1) \\ \gamma_{12}^{(0)} &= -32 & \gamma_{12}^{(1)} &= 80C_F \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

Defining $K_2 = K\gamma_{22}^{(0)}/2\beta_0$ we then find for the solution of the renormalization group equation

$$\frac{d}{d\ln\mu}\vec{c} = \gamma^T\vec{c} \quad (79)$$

$$c_1(\mu) \equiv 1 \quad (80)$$

$$c_2(\mu) = V_{21}(1 - K_2) + a(\mu)[J_{21} + V_{21}J_{22}(1 - K_2)] + a(M_W)(B_2 - J_{21})K_2 \quad (81)$$

4.3 Step 3

The last step consists of integrating out the charm quark. This adds an additional contribution to the coefficient of the operator Q which in view of (80) is simply given by the renormalized matrix element of the operator O at a scale $\mu = O(m)$, already quoted in (70).

4.4 Final Result for the Box Contribution

Collecting all this and using (67) we finally obtain the effective hamiltonian induced from box diagrams with charm, including the NLL QCD effects between

the scales M_W and $\mu = O(m_c)$:

$$\mathcal{H}_{eff,c}^{(B)} = -\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\alpha}{2\pi \sin^2 \Theta_W} \lambda_c 4B_{NL}^{(1/2)} (\bar{s}d)_{V-A} (\bar{\nu}_l \nu_l)_{V-A} \quad (82)$$

$$B_{NL}^{(1/2)} = -\frac{x(\mu)}{64} \left[16 \left(\ln \frac{\mu^2}{m^2} + \frac{5}{4} + \frac{r \ln r}{1-r} \right) + \frac{c_2(\mu)}{a(\mu)} \right] \quad (83)$$

(82) is written here for one ν -flavor. The index (1/2) refers to the weak isospin of the final state leptons.

If we set $N = 3$, $f = 4$ and use (56) we arrive at the expression given in (16).

We would like to add a few important remarks.

- As usual we are working in the NDR-scheme; all scheme dependent quantities that we have given above (one-loop initial values and two-loop anomalous dimensions) refer to this scheme. However in the case of the box contribution there is an additional scheme dependence involved which arises from the treatment of the particular Dirac structure. In our calculation we have used the following projection

$$\gamma^\mu \gamma^\alpha \gamma^\nu (1 - \gamma_5) \otimes \gamma_\mu \gamma_\alpha \gamma_\nu (1 - \gamma_5) \rightarrow 4(4 - \varepsilon) \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma_5) \otimes \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) \quad (84)$$

A different treatment of this expression would lead to different values for B_2 and $\gamma_{12}^{(1)}$ and would correspond to a different renormalization scheme. This "projection scheme dependence" of course cancels in the final result provided coefficient and anomalous dimension are evaluated consistently.

- The proof of the cancellation of all scheme dependences (e.g. the projection scheme dependence mentioned above) proceeds in the same way as discussed at the end of section 3.
- The operator O contains quark fields only in the form of local currents and therefore has no anomalous dimension. This feature is reflected in the structure of the anomalous dimension matrix in (73). As a consequence the coefficient c_1 of O is μ -independent (80).
- In contrast to the case of the Z-penguin the box contribution involves an additional mass parameter m_l , the mass of the internal charged lepton in the box diagram. While m_l can be neglected compared to the charm mass ($r \approx 0$) in the case of the electron or the muon, it is certainly non-negligible

in the case of the tau. The effect of a nonvanishing lepton mass of the order of the charm quark mass is represented by the r -dependent term in the expressions for $B_{NL}^{(1/2)}$ in (83), (16). A comparison with (70) shows that the dependence on m_l arises entirely from the matrix element of the operator O , evaluated at the scale $\mu = O(m_c)$. Note in particular that the initial values for the Wilson coefficients (72) and the anomalous dimensions (78) do not depend on m_l . This is intuitively clear since the Wilson coefficient depends only on the short distance structure of the effective interaction and must therefore be independent of the low energy scale m_l .

In this context the GIM mechanism plays an essential role. The contracted box diagrams with charm (figs.4, 5) obviously have a quadratic divergence. However, what really matters for the matrix element of O is the *difference* between the charm- and the up-quark contribution (see (68)). As a consequence the matrix element $\langle O \rangle$ is only logarithmically divergent. It follows then that the difference between the cases $m_l = 0$ and $m_l \neq 0$ is *finite* and hence does not affect the anomalous dimensions, as it must be in a mass independent scheme like minimal subtraction. To conclude, the effect of the GIM mechanism is nontrivial in the case of the box with nonvanishing lepton mass, whereas it is not explicitly visible for $m_l = 0$ (and in the case of the Z-penguin) since in these latter cases the up-quark contribution is anyway vanishing in dimensional regularization.

5 Discussion of the Charm Contribution to Next-To-Leading Order

In sections 3 and 4 we have calculated the Z-penguin and box-parts of the charm contribution to the effective hamiltonian for $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ decay in NLLA. The explicit results for the functions C_{NL} and $B_{NL}^{(1/2)}$ are given in (13) and (16) respectively. Combining these functions, which depend on the W-boson gauge, into the gauge independent combination

$$X_{NL} = C_{NL} - 4B_{NL}^{(1/2)} \quad (85)$$

we can next write down the final result for the charm contribution to the effective hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H}_{eff,c} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\alpha}{2\pi \sin^2 \Theta_W} \lambda_c X_{NL} (\bar{s}d)_{V-A} (\bar{\nu}\nu)_{V-A} \quad (86)$$

We proceed to discuss various aspects of this result in what follows.

Let us first compare the charm- with the top-contribution as obtained in [15]. In the case of the top the internal quark mass is large and comparable to M_W so that no large logarithms appear. The charm mass on the other hand is very much smaller than M_W and logarithmic terms become important. For these reasons the two cases, regarding the theoretical methods required, are quite complementary to each other: For the top-part a consideration of QCD effects in straightforward perturbation theory to $O(\alpha_s)$ is appropriate, but all orders have to be kept in the mass ratio m_t/M_W . On the contrary the charm contribution allows a restriction to the order $O(x_c)$ in the mass ratio but requires summation of leading and next-to-leading logarithms to all orders in QCD. From this consideration it follows that one can check the top contribution against the charm contribution by taking the limit $x \ll 1$ in the former case and simultaneously expanding the RG result to $O(a)$ in the latter.

Recall that the function X in (8) consists of a Z-penguin- and a box-part C and B , respectively

$$X(x) = C(x) - 4B(x, +1/2) \quad (87)$$

Keeping only terms linear in x in the exact results of [15] we have ($m_l = 0$)

$$C(x) \doteq \frac{1}{4}x \ln x + \frac{3}{4}x + a \left(2x \ln^2 x + \frac{23}{3}x \ln x + \frac{29 + 2\pi^2}{3}x \right) \quad (88)$$

$$4B(x, +1/2) \doteq x \ln x + x + a \left(4x \ln^2 x + \frac{44}{3}x \ln x + \frac{52 + 4\pi^2}{3}x \right) \quad (89)$$

Expanding now the RG-functions C_{NL} and $B_{NL}^{(1/2)}$ (for $r = 0$) in (13) and (16) to $O(a)$, thereby "switching off" the renormalization group summations, we obtain in fact the first four terms in (88) and (89) respectively. Let us mention a few interesting points.

- The last terms in (88), (89) are of $O(ax)$ and go beyond the NLLA; therefore they can of course not be obtained from C_{NL} and B_{NL} .

- A comparison of B_{NL} , expanded to $O(a)$, with (89) may also be used to determine the two-loop anomalous dimension $\gamma_{12}^{(1)}$. Once $\gamma_{12}^{(1)}$ is known, the full next-to-leading order expression for the box can be obtained. This observation allows to circumvent the explicit evaluation of the two-loop diagrams in the effective theory (fig.5) – the information on $\gamma_{12}^{(1)}$ is already contained in the calculation of $B(x, +1/2)$ in [15].
- By contrast, the same exercise for C_{NL} shows that (88) only yields the value for $(\gamma_{+3}^{(1)} + \gamma_{-3}^{(1)})$. To get both elements $\gamma_{\pm 3}^{(1)}$ separately it is necessary to investigate the calculation in the effective theory (fig.3). Still this feature can be used as a cross-check.

An important issue is the independence of the physical amplitude on the renormalization scale μ . Since in our case the operator $(\bar{s}d)_{V-A}(\bar{\nu}\nu)_{V-A}$ has no anomalous dimension, also the coefficient functions C , B and X are μ -independent. However, because we are working in perturbation theory, the μ -independence is valid only up to terms of the neglected order. As a side remark we mention that the renormalization scale μ appearing in our final expressions C_{NL} and B_{NL} can be viewed also as the scale at which the charm quark is removed from the effective theory. This interpretation is clear from step 3 of the derivation given in section 3. Although this scale should be of the same order as the charm quark mass, it is not necessary that μ equals m_c exactly. Therefore we have displayed the μ -dependence explicitly in our formulae and have not set $\mu = m_c$. This allows us in particular to investigate the residual μ -dependence. To do so consider first the leading-log parts of C_{NL} and B_{NL} (in (54) and (83)) and their variation with μ :

$$\frac{d}{d \ln \mu} \left(\frac{x(\mu)}{32a(\mu)} [V_{31}(K_+ - K_{33}) + V_{32}(K_- - K_{33})] \right) = \frac{x}{32} [\gamma_{+3}^{(0)} K_+ + \gamma_{-3}^{(0)} K_-] + O(ax) \quad (90)$$

$$\frac{d}{d \ln \mu} \left(\frac{x(\mu)}{64a(\mu)} V_{21}(K_2 - 1) \right) = -\frac{x}{64} \gamma_{12}^{(0)} + O(ax) \quad (91)$$

We can see that the residual μ -dependence for the leading-log result is of the order $O(x)$. Formally terms of this order are neglected in LLA and the results are μ -independent to the order considered in this approximation. Numerically however the residual μ -dependence is quite pronounced as we will see below. Furthermore we note again that treating QCD corrections in LLA and keeping

the non-logarithmic $O(x)$ terms in $X_0(x)$ would strictly speaking be inconsistent; a variation of the scale μ , which is not fixed in LLA, would give rise to terms of the same order. Similarly the non-negligible contribution from the tau-lepton mass term is a next-to-leading order effect (see (83)).

All these considerations underline once more that the leading-log approximation is unsatisfactory. An improvement can only be achieved by going beyond the leading order. In particular in NLLA the μ -dependence of $O(x)$ in the leading order terms of C_{NL} and B_{NL} given in (90) and (91) is cancelled by the explicitly μ -dependent terms appearing at next-to-leading order, as is evident from (54) and (83). As a result the remaining μ -dependence is $O(ax)$ instead of $O(x)$. What this amounts to numerically is illustrated in fig.6 where we have plotted the charm-function X_{NL} (for $m_l = 0$) compared to the leading-log result X_L and the case without QCD for values of μ between 1 and 3 GeV . We observe the following features:

- The residual slope of X_{NL} is indeed considerably smaller in comparison to X_L , which exhibits a quite substantial dependence on the unphysical scale μ . The variation of X (defined as $(X(1GeV) - X(3GeV))/X(m_c)$) is 18.8% in NLLA compared to 52.7% in LLA.
- As already anticipated in the Introduction, the suppression of the uncorrected function through QCD effects is somewhat less pronounced in NLLA.
- The next-to-leading effects amount to a $\sim 10\%$ correction relative to X_L at $\mu = m_c$. However the size of this correction strongly depends on μ due to the scale ambiguity of the result. This means that the question of how large the next-to-leading effects compared to the LLA really are cannot be answered uniquely. Therefore we focus our attention on the more important issue of the μ -dependence and its reduction in NLLA.

Whereas it is meaningful to use $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}$ in X_{NL} one has no control on the exact definition of the QCD scale in leading order (Λ_{LO}). Λ_{LO} must be of the same order of magnitude as $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}$ but is undetermined otherwise, which constitutes a further problem of the LLA. For definiteness of the comparison we have set $\Lambda_{LO} = \Lambda_{\overline{MS}} = 0.25GeV$ in fig.6. Finally in table 1 we give the numerical values for X_{NL}^e and X_{NL}^τ for $\mu = m_c$ and several values of $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}$ and $m_c(m_c)$. The reduction of X_{NL} through the effect of m_τ is clearly visible.

	$X_{NL}^e/10^{-4}$			$X_{NL}^\tau/10^{-4}$		
$\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}, m_c [GeV]$	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.2	1.3	1.4
0.15	10.24	11.95	13.78	6.99	8.40	9.92
0.25	9.51	11.18	12.97	6.26	7.63	9.11
0.35	8.74	10.39	12.15	5.49	6.83	8.29

Table 1: The function X_{NL} for various $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}$ and m_c .

6 Phenomenological Implications for $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$, V_{td} and the Unitarity Triangle

6.1 General Expressions

In the present section we will finally discuss the expression for the branching ratio of $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$, including the complete $O(\alpha_s)$ corrections to the top contribution and the renormalization group result in NLLA for the charm part. As applications we will discuss consequences for a possible determination of $|V_{td}|$ from a measured $B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})$ and the impact of our results on the unitarity triangle. In our presentation we follow chapter 6.2. of [1]. There a detailed investigation of the $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ phenomenology has been performed with QCD corrections treated in LLA. While the discussion in [1] concentrated on the various uncertainties arising from standard model parameters like CKM elements and quark masses, we will put emphasis on the theoretical uncertainties due to residual dependences on the renormalization scale.

Taking (7), summing over the three neutrino flavors and expressing CKM variables in terms of the Wolfenstein parameters λ , A , ϱ and η , we obtain for the branching ratio

$$B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}) = \frac{3\alpha^2 B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 e^+ \nu)}{2\pi^2 \sin^4 \Theta_W} \lambda^8 A^4 X^2(x_t) \left[\eta^2 + \frac{2}{3}(\varrho_o^e - \varrho)^2 + \frac{1}{3}(\varrho_o^\tau - \varrho)^2 \right] \quad (92)$$

where

$$\varrho_o^l = 1 + \frac{1 - \frac{\lambda^2}{2}}{\lambda^4 A^2} \frac{X_{NL}^l}{X(x_t)} \quad (93)$$

Using the numerical values for various parameters as collected in (101) and (102) we find the expressions quoted in section 2. Here and in the following we have used the QCD corrected top contribution $X(x_t)$ as it stands and made no effort to expand functions of $X(x_t)$ to first order in α_s . For renormalization scales not too far from m_t this is anyway irrelevant numerically.

Eq.(92) defines a circle in the (ϱ, η) plane with center at $(\varrho_o, 0)$, where

$$\varrho_o = 1 + (1 - \frac{\lambda^2}{2}) \frac{X_{NL}^e - \frac{1}{3}\delta X_{NL}^\tau}{\lambda^4 A^2 X(x_t)} \quad (94)$$

and with the radius squared

$$r_o^2 = \frac{1}{\lambda^8 A^4 X^2(x_t)} \left[\frac{2\pi^2 \sin^4 \Theta_W B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})}{3\alpha^2 B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 e^+ \nu)} - \frac{2}{9} \left((1 - \frac{\lambda^2}{2}) \delta X_{NL}^\tau \right)^2 \right] \quad (95)$$

Here we have defined

$$\delta X_{NL}^\tau = X_{NL}^e - X_{NL}^\tau = \frac{xr \ln r}{r - 1} \quad (96)$$

The restriction to leading logarithmic accuracy in the above formulae is made by replacing $X(x_t) \rightarrow X_0(x_t)$ and $X_{NL}^l \rightarrow X_L$. The difference δX_{NL}^τ should be set to zero in LLA for consistency as discussed in section 5.

We recall a few important definitions related to the unitarity triangle in the (ϱ, η) plane. First we introduce [1]

$$R_b = \frac{|V_{ub}|}{|V_{us}V_{cb}|} \quad R_t = \frac{|V_{td}|}{|V_{us}V_{ts}|} \quad (97)$$

To a very good approximation these can be expressed in terms of ϱ and η as

$$R_b = \sqrt{\varrho^2 + \eta^2} \quad R_t = \sqrt{(1 - \varrho)^2 + \eta^2} \quad (98)$$

The circle defined in the (ϱ, η) plane by the value for $B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})$ ((94) and (95)) intersects for the allowed range of parameters with the circle determined by a value for R_b . This allows to determine R_t . One finds

$$R_t^2 = 1 + R_b^2 + \frac{r_o^2 - R_b^2}{\varrho_o} - \varrho_o \quad (99)$$

6.2 The Analysis of $|V_{td}|$

The modulus of V_{td} is obtained as

$$|V_{td}| = A\lambda^3 R_t \quad (100)$$

	m_t/GeV	m_c/GeV	$\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}/GeV$	A	R_b	$B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})/10^{-10}$
	150	1.3	0.25	0.89	0.45	1.0
I	± 50	± 0.1	± 0.10	± 0.08	± 0.14	± 0.5
II	± 5	± 0.05	± 0.05	± 0.04	± 0.05	± 0.1

Table 2: Collection of input parameters with two different choices for the uncertainties.

We note that besides A (or $|V_{cb}|$) and m_t the value of R_b (or $|V_{ub}/V_{cb}|$) is needed together with the branching ratio in order to extract $|V_{td}|$ from $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ decay.

Before discussing numerical examples we will now compile the input parameters necessary for the analysis. We take

$$M_W = 80 GeV \quad m_\tau = 1.78 GeV \quad \lambda = 0.22 \quad (101)$$

$$\alpha = 1/128 \quad \sin^2 \Theta_W = 0.23 \quad B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 e^+ \nu) = 4.8 \cdot 10^{-2} \quad (102)$$

The remaining parameters are given in table 2 together with two different sets of uncertainties. Range I corresponds to the present status with the exception of $B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})$, where we have just chosen a typical number. For later discussion we have also displayed range II illustrating some possible future scenario. The values of A and R_b correspond to $|V_{cb}| = 0.043 \pm 0.004$ and $|V_{ub}/V_{cb}| = 0.10 \pm 0.03$ (range I), which are in the ball park of various determinations. The mass parameters m_t and m_c in table 2 stand for $m_t(m_t)$ and $m_c(m_c)$.

The various uncertainties in all these parameters result in a rather large range of predicted values for $B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})$, typically $(1 - 6) \cdot 10^{-10}$. Similar uncertainties exist for the determination of $|V_{td}|$ from the branching ratio [1, 7].

However, these uncertainties from input parameters should be distinguished from the uncertainties arising due to the μ -dependences of the physical amplitudes, which have their origin in the truncation of the perturbation series. The parameters could in principle be considered as determined from somewhere else and in the ideal case known without errors. However even in this case there would still remain the μ -scale ambiguity which constitutes the intrinsic uncertainty of the theoretical prediction. An improvement in this issue would require going even beyond NLLA.

For these reasons we will focus our attention on the scale ambiguity and compare

LLA and NLLA in this respect. As an illustration of this point let us consider the determination of $|V_{td}|$ via (100). We fix all input parameters at their central values but allow a variation of the renormalization scales within the ranges $1\text{GeV} \leq \mu_c \leq 3\text{GeV}$ and $100\text{GeV} \leq \mu_t \leq 300\text{GeV}$ in the charm- and the top-sector, respectively. The variation of the unphysical scales μ_c and μ_t is of course not unique. To avoid large logarithms μ_c and μ_t should however not deviate too much from m_c and m_t respectively. Our ranges of μ_c , μ_t , chosen for definiteness, satisfy this requirement. The ensuing variations in predictions of physical quantities are to be understood as indications for typical theoretical uncertainties to be expected due to the truncation of the perturbation series.

We find

$$8.58 \cdot 10^{-3} \leq |V_{td}| \leq 11.35 \cdot 10^{-3} \quad \text{LLA} \quad (103)$$

$$9.51 \cdot 10^{-3} \leq |V_{td}| \leq 10.22 \cdot 10^{-3} \quad \text{NLLA} \quad (104)$$

The central values at $\mu_c = m_c$ and $\mu_t = m_t$ are

$$|V_{td}| = 9.49 \cdot 10^{-3} \quad \text{LLA} \quad (105)$$

$$|V_{td}| = 9.68 \cdot 10^{-3} \quad \text{NLLA} \quad (106)$$

One observes that including the full next-to-leading order corrections reduces the total variation from 29% (LLA) to 7% (NLLA) in the present example. The main bulk of this ambiguity stems from the charm sector. Keeping $\mu_c = m_c$ fixed and varying only μ_t , the ambiguities would shrink to 10% (LLA) and 1% (NLLA). These purely theoretical uncertainties should be compared to those coming from the input parameters. To get an idea of their magnitude we show in table 3 the relative change of $|V_{td}|$ when one parameter is varied in the two ranges given in table 2 while all other parameters are kept fixed. The entries in the first row indicate the varying parameter. We note that the dependence on $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}$ and R_b is quite small. It is clear that at the present stage with $B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})$ being unknown and with a large range of possible top quark masses, the theoretical errors related to scale ambiguities seem rather marginal. However the determination of relevant parameters should improve in the future. Once the corresponding precision will have attained the level exemplified by our choice of parameter range II in table 1, the resulting uncertainties will start to be comparable to the theoretical uncertainty of about 7%. Clearly, in such a situation the gain in accuracy of the

$\Delta V_{td} / V_{td} $	m_t	m_c	$\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}$	A	R_b	$B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})$
I	78.5%	11.6%	5.7%	16.8%	3.4%	70.8%
II	7.2%	5.8%	2.8%	8.4%	1.2%	13.3%

Table 3: Relative sensitivity of $|V_{td}|$ to variations of input parameters according to table 2.

theoretical prediction by a factor of more than 4 compared to the LLA will be very important. In order to show this more explicitly we plot in fig.8 $|V_{td}|$ as a function of $m_t(m_t)$, keeping all other input parameters at their central values but varying μ_c and μ_t according to $1\text{GeV} \leq \mu_c \leq 3\text{GeV}$ and $\frac{2}{3}m_t \leq \mu_t \leq 2m_t$. The broad and the narrow band correspond to LLA and NLLA respectively. This figure illustrates very clearly that the next-to-leading QCD analysis is necessary to really exploit the clean nature of $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ in future constraints on important standard model parameters.

To summarize: Whereas in LLA the scale ambiguity would be the main uncertainty in $|V_{td}|$ provided m_t and $B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})$ have been accurately measured, the main uncertainty after our calculation of next-to-leading order corrections comes from the value of V_{cb} or A .

6.3 The Impact on the Unitarity Triangle

It should be emphasized that the measurement of $B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})$ will not only determine $|V_{td}|$ but also constrain the shape of the unitarity triangle. Indeed the parameters ϱ and η can be determined from $B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})$ once R_b , $|V_{cb}|$ and m_t are known. We find

$$\varrho = \frac{1}{2} \left(\varrho_o + \frac{R_b^2 - r_o^2}{\varrho_o} \right) \quad (107)$$

$$\eta = \sqrt{R_b^2 - \varrho^2} \quad (108)$$

with ϱ_o and r_o given by (94) and (95). η is bound to be positive when the experimental result for the CP violating parameter ε is taken into account [1].

Here we would like to discuss the sensitivity of r_o , ϱ_o , ϱ and η to the choice of renormalization scales. We first note following [1] that the second term in (95) is

negligible. Consequently

$$r_o = \frac{1}{A^2 X(x_t)} \sqrt{\frac{B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})}{4.62 \cdot 10^{-11}}} \quad (109)$$

is entirely determined by the top contribution to $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$. Now as we stressed in [14, 15] and in discussing $|V_{td}|$ above, the scale dependence in $X(x_t)$ is after the inclusion of next-to-leading order corrections reduced from $O(10\%)$ to $O(1\%)$. Consequently the theoretical calculation of r_o is fully under control once A , m_t and $B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})$ have been precisely measured.

In the absence of charm contributions one would have $\varrho_o = 1$. Thus the departure of ϱ_o from unity measures the impact of the charm contribution on the determination of the unitarity triangle. Since in LLA there was a considerable scale ambiguity in the charm contribution we expect this to show up also in the determination of ϱ_o , ϱ and η . To summarize this discussion we have displayed in table 4 the μ -dependences of r_o , ϱ_o , ϱ , η , $|V_{td}|$ and $B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})$. Again we take the central values for all input parameters but vary μ_c and μ_t in the ranges $1\text{GeV} \leq \mu_c \leq 3\text{GeV}$, $100\text{GeV} \leq \mu_t \leq 300\text{GeV}$. For each quantity we show the resulting minimal and maximal value, in NLLA as well as in LLA, together with the percentage of this variation referring to the standard value ($\mu_c = m_c$ and $\mu_t = m_t$). For the evaluation of $B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})$ one has to fix ϱ and η . We have chosen $\varrho = 0.08$, $\eta = 0.44$ which correspond to a central value of $B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}) = 10^{-10}$ in NLLA.

As anticipated the scale uncertainties present in LLA are considerably reduced in NLLA. This is in particular seen in the case of ϱ where the uncertainty $\Delta\varrho = 0.31$ present in LLA is reduced to $\Delta\varrho = 0.08$ after the inclusion of next-to-leading order corrections. The very small ambiguity in η results partly from the small value of ϱ chosen in this example, but generally η is less sensitive to μ than ϱ .

In fig.9 we show the position of the point (ϱ, η) which determines the unitarity triangle. To this end we have fixed all parameters at their central values except for R_b for which we have chosen three representative numbers, $R_b = 0.31, 0.45, 0.59$. The full and the reduced ranges represent LLA and NLLA respectively. The impact of our calculations on the accuracy of determining the unitarity triangle is quite impressive. We note that the reduction in the uncertainty in ϱ may allow to resolve the two-fold ambiguity ($\varrho > 0$, $\varrho < 0$) present in the analysis of the CP-violating ε -parameter.

NLLA (LLA)	r_o	ϱ_o	ϱ	η
$\mu_{c(t)} = m_{c(t)}$	1.39 (1.37)	1.39 (1.39)	0.08 (0.10)	0.44 (0.44)
min	1.38 (1.31)	1.34 (1.24)	0.02 (-0.12)	0.44 (0.41)
max	1.40 (1.45)	1.41 (1.49)	0.10 (0.19)	0.45 (0.45)
	1.0% (9.8%)	5.3% (17.6%)	—	2.3% (9.7%)

NLLA (LLA)	$ V_{td} /10^{-3}$	$B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})/10^{-10}$
$\mu_{c(t)} = m_{c(t)}$	9.68 (9.49)	1.00 (1.03)
min	9.51 (8.58)	0.92 (0.76)
max	10.22 (11.35)	1.03 (1.19)
	7.4% (29.2%)	10.9% (41.0%)

Table 4: Various quantities relevant for the phenomenology of $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ and their theoretical uncertainties in LLA and in NLLA.

We note also that the 40% uncertainty in $B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})$ present in LLA is reduced to 11% in NLLA. This is also seen in fig.10 where $B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})$ is given as a function of m_t for central values of the parameters. The meaning of the curves is as in fig.8.

7 Short Distance Contribution to $K_L \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ Beyond Leading Logs

7.1 Renormalization Group Analysis

The branching ratio $B(K_L \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)$ has already been measured in experiment [21]. However, since this decay receives important long distance contributions, a complete theoretical treatment is more difficult than in the case of $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$. Recent discussions of this issue have been given in [22, 23, 24]. Yet the pure short distance part of $K_L \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ is on the same footing as $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ and can be calculated by the same methods. Since the computation is very similar in both cases, we will restrict ourselves to mainly quote the final results for $K_L \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$, indicating the most important differences to the case of $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$.

The effective Hamiltonian inducing the short distance contribution to $K_L \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ can be written as

$$\mathcal{H}_{eff} = -\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\alpha}{2\pi \sin^2 \Theta_W} (V_{cs}^* V_{cd} Y_{NL} + V_{ts}^* V_{td} Y(x_t)) (\bar{s}d)_{V-A} (\bar{\mu}\mu)_{V-A} \quad (110)$$

The resulting branching ratio is

$$B(K_L \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)_{SD} = \frac{\alpha^2 B(K^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu) \tau(K_L)}{V_{us}^2 \pi^2 \sin^4 \Theta_W \tau(K^+)} [Re V_{cs}^* V_{cd} Y_{NL} + Re V_{ts}^* V_{td} Y(x_t)]^2 \quad (111)$$

The function $Y(x)$ is given by

$$Y(x) = Y_0(x) + aY_1(x) \quad (112)$$

where [3]

$$Y_0(x) = \frac{x}{8} \left[\frac{4-x}{1-x} + \frac{3x}{(1-x)^2} \ln x \right] \quad (113)$$

and [15]

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1(x) = & \frac{4x + 16x^2 + 4x^3}{3(1-x)^2} - \frac{4x - 10x^2 - x^3 - x^4}{(1-x)^3} \ln x \\ & + \frac{2x - 14x^2 + x^3 - x^4}{2(1-x)^3} \ln^2 x + \frac{2x + x^3}{(1-x)^2} L_2(1-x) \\ & + 8x \frac{\partial Y_0(x)}{\partial x} \ln x_\mu \end{aligned} \quad (114)$$

The RG expression Y_{NL} representing the charm contribution reads

$$Y_{NL} = C_{NL} - B_{NL}^{(-1/2)} \quad (115)$$

where C_{NL} is the Z-penguin part given in (13) and $B_{NL}^{(-1/2)}$ is the box contribution in the charm sector, relevant for the case of final state leptons with weak isospin $T_3 = -1/2$. We find

$$\begin{aligned} B_{NL}^{(-1/2)} = & \frac{x(m)}{4} K_c^{\frac{24}{25}} \left[3(1-K_2) \left(\frac{1}{a(\mu)} + \frac{15212}{1875} (1-K_c^{-1}) \right) \right. \\ & \left. - \ln \frac{\mu^2}{m^2} - \frac{329}{12} + \frac{15212}{625} K_2 + \frac{30581}{7500} K K_2 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (116)$$

Note the simple relation to $B_{NL}^{(1/2)}$ in (16) (for $r = 0$)

$$B_{NL}^{(-1/2)} - B_{NL}^{(1/2)} = \frac{x(m)}{2} K_c^{\frac{24}{25}} (K K_2 - 1) \quad (117)$$

For the Z-penguin contribution the change from neutrinos to muons as external leptons is trivial and the corresponding function C_{NL} is the same in both cases. The box-part on the other hand is slightly different for $K_L \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ and $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ since the lepton line in the box diagram is reversed. As a first consequence no internal lepton mass appears in the case of $K_L \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$. The renormalization group calculation is however very similar to the one for $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$. We comment briefly on the most important differences. Starting point are again eqs. (67)–(69) but with the operator Q now defined as

$$Q = \frac{m^2}{g^2} (\bar{s}d)_{V-A} (\bar{\mu}\mu)_{V-A} \quad (118)$$

Using the NDR-scheme and the projection

$$\gamma^\mu \gamma^\alpha \gamma^\nu (1 - \gamma_5) \otimes \gamma_\nu \gamma_\alpha \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) \rightarrow 4(1 - 2\varepsilon) \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma_5) \otimes \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) \quad (119)$$

we have instead of (70)

$$\langle O \rangle = -a(\mu) \left(4 \ln \frac{\mu^2}{m^2} - 2 \right) \langle Q \rangle \quad (120)$$

For $B_{NL}^{(-1/2)}$ one then finds

$$B_{NL}^{(-1/2)} = \frac{x(\mu)}{16} \left[-4 \ln \frac{\mu^2}{m^2} + 2 + \frac{c_2(\mu)}{a(\mu)} \right] \quad (121)$$

The Wilson coefficient $c_2(\mu)$ is as given in (81), however with different values for B_2 and γ_{12} :

$$B_2 = 2 \quad \gamma_{12}^{(0)} = 8 \quad \gamma_{12}^{(1)} = 160 C_F \quad (122)$$

Putting all this together, using (56) and setting $N = 3$, $f = 4$ one finally obtains (116).

7.2 Discussion of the charm contribution

We now turn to the discussion of theoretical uncertainties. In the top-quark sector the residual scale dependence is almost completely eliminated when the $O(\alpha_s)$ corrections are included (112), just as in the case of $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$. The charm contribution is again more problematic in this respect. In addition it exhibits a somewhat different structure than the charm sector in $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$.

To see this, recall that the function Y [15] reads in terms of the Z-penguin- and box-contribution

$$Y(x) = C(x) - B(x, -1/2) \quad (123)$$

where, to linear order in x , C is given in (88) and

$$B(x, -1/2) \doteq \frac{1}{4}x \ln x + \frac{1}{4}x + a \left(x \ln^2 x + \frac{23}{3}x \ln x + \frac{25 + \pi^2}{3}x \right) \quad (124)$$

It follows that the terms of $O(x \ln x)$ and $O(ax \ln x)$ both cancel in

$$Y(x) \doteq \frac{1}{2}x + a \left(x \ln^2 x + \frac{4 + \pi^2}{3}x \right) \quad (125)$$

We will briefly comment on the most prominent differences of Y_{NL} and X_{NL} . First, without QCD no logarithmic terms are present in $Y(x)$, as can be seen in (125). They are to lowest order cancelled between the Z-penguin- and the box contribution. As a consequence the non-logarithmic term $\sim x$ is more important here than in the case of X_{NL} . Logarithms are generated through QCD and summed to next-to-leading order in the renormalization group result (115). Their effect is to enhance the zeroth order expression by a factor of about 2.5. Recall that the function $X(x_c)$ on the contrary is suppressed by $\sim 30\%$ through QCD effects. Nevertheless numerically X_{NL} still exceeds Y_{NL} by a factor of four. Comparing the magnitude of the corrections in X_{NL} and Y_{NL} one realizes that QCD is much more important in Y_{NL} than in X_{NL} . The consequence is a larger relative μ -dependence of Y_{NL} . In fact one finds $(Y_{NL}(1\text{GeV}) - Y_{NL}(3\text{GeV}))/Y_{NL}(m_c) = 43.6\%$ whereas in LLA $(\tilde{Y}_L(1\text{GeV}) - \tilde{Y}_L(3\text{GeV}))/\tilde{Y}_L(m_c) = 71\%$. Here $\tilde{Y}_L$ is defined to be the leading log function but including the numerically important term $x(\mu)/2$, although this is not fully consistent in this approximation. The effect of a b-quark threshold, which we neglect, is also larger here ($\sim 1\%$) than it was for X_{NL} .

The μ -dependences are illustrated in fig.7 where the leading log result is shown without (Y_L) and including ($\tilde{Y}_L$) the non-logarithmic term $x/2$. Since the residual μ -dependence turns out to be quite pronounced even in NLLA, one may start to worry about the validity of perturbation theory. At least the scale ambiguity is substantially reduced when going from leading logs to NLLA. We will take the observed variation as an estimate for the theoretical uncertainty even in this case and briefly discuss the consequences in the next subsection. Fortunately the function Y_{NL} is less important for $K_L \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ than X_{NL} is for $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu}$.

	$Y_{NL}/10^{-4}$		
$\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}, m_c [GeV]$	1.2	1.3	1.4
0.15	2.78	3.18	3.61
0.25	2.96	3.39	3.84
0.35	3.10	3.55	4.03

Table 5: The function Y_{NL} for various $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}$ and m_c .

Consequently the net impact of the μ -dependence on $B(K_L \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-)_{SD}$ will turn out to be not as dramatic as could be expected from the discussion above. Finally in table 5 we give numerical values of Y_{NL} for various m_c and $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}$ with $\mu_c = m_c$.

7.3 $B(K_L \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-)_{SD}$ and the Parameter ϱ

Expressing CKM elements through Wolfenstein parameters we find

$$B(K_L \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-)_{SD} = 1.71 \cdot 10^{-9} A^4 Y^2(x_t) [\bar{\varrho}_o - \varrho]^2 \quad (126)$$

where

$$\bar{\varrho}_o = 1 + \frac{417}{A^2} \frac{Y_{NL}}{Y(x_t)} \quad (127)$$

Formula (126) together with $Y(x_t)$ and Y_{NL} in (112) and (115) respectively gives $B(K_L \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-)_{SD}$ in the standard model with QCD effects in next-to-leading order. It is the generalization of the QCD calculations in [4] where only leading logs and some non-leading contributions have been taken into account. The experimental value of $B(K_L \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-)_{SD}$ determines the value of ϱ given by

$$\varrho = \bar{\varrho}_o - \bar{r}_o \quad \bar{r}_o = \sqrt{\frac{B(K_L \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-)_{SD}}{1.71 \cdot 10^{-9}}} \frac{1}{A^2 Y(x_t)} \quad (128)$$

Similarly to r_o in the case of $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu}$, the value of $\bar{r}_o$ is fully determined by the top contribution which has only a very weak renormalization scale ambiguity after the inclusion of $O(\alpha_s)$ corrections. The main scale ambiguity is present in $\bar{\varrho}_o$ whose departure from unity measures the relative importance of the charm contribution. In order to illustrate the scale ambiguities in the context of $K_L \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ we show in table 6 $\bar{r}_o$, $\bar{\varrho}_o$, ϱ and $B(K_L \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-)_{SD}$ and their uncertainties.

NLLA (LLA)	$\bar{r}_o$	$\bar{\varrho}_o$	ϱ	$B(K_L \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-)_{SD}/10^{-9}$
$\mu_{c(t)} = m_{c(t)}$	1.12 (1.16)	1.21 (1.20)	0.09 (0.04)	1.00 (0.91)
min	1.12 (1.10)	1.14 (1.10)	0.02 (-0.14)	0.88 (0.67)
max	1.12 (1.26)	1.24 (1.27)	0.12 (0.14)	1.05 (1.09)
	0.6% (13.8%)	7.6% (13.8%)	—	16.8% (45.8%)

Table 6: Theoretical uncertainties in the phenomenology of $K_L \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ in LLA and NLLA.

Here the same input is used as for table 4 (sect. 6.3.). To obtain the numbers in the last column we have set $\varrho = 0.09$, corresponding to $B(K_L \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-)_{SD} = 10^{-9}$ in NLLA.

In the case of ϱ the uncertainty $\Delta\varrho = 0.28$ present in LLA is reduced to $\Delta\varrho = 0.10$ in NLLA. Similarly the 46% uncertainty in $B(K_L \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-)_{SD}$ is reduced to 17%. This theoretical uncertainty in the short-distance part of $K_L \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ left over even after inclusion of next-to-leading order corrections together with the poorly known long distance contributions makes this decay unfortunately less suitable for the determination of standard model parameters than $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu}$.

8 Summary

In this paper we have given a detailed analysis of the theoretical prediction for the rare decay $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ in the standard model. We have performed the first calculation of QCD effects in this process at the next-to-leading order. This required two different approaches, the inclusion of the full $O(\alpha_s)$ correction to all orders in m_t/M_W for the top-quark contribution [14, 15] and a two-loop renormalization group calculation in the charm quark case performed here. Compared to the previous leading-log estimates [4, 5, 6] the main benefits of our analysis are:

- The scale ambiguity in the top quark mass can be essentially removed.
- The scale dependence is substantially reduced in the charm sector. Consequently the uncertainty due to the choice of $m_c(\mu)$ stressed in [7, 8] is also reduced automatically.

- The next-to-leading renormalization group calculation allows a meaningful use of $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}$ for the charm contribution.
- The non-logarithmic mass terms $\sim x_c$ and the effect of the tau-lepton mass can be incorporated consistently.
- The renormalization scheme dependence in QCD corrections to non-logarithmic terms addressed in [5] can be avoided.

The consequence of these improvements is a considerably reduced uncertainty of the theoretical prediction for $B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})$ and in the related determination of CKM parameters from this decay.

As a byproduct of the analysis of $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ the short-distance part of $K_L \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ has been obtained in NLLA. In this case the scale uncertainties are also reduced considerably compared to the LLA, but the residual ambiguity is larger than in $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$. Still $B(K_L \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)_{SD}$ could be used to constrain the Wolfenstein parameter ϱ with improved accuracy in NLLA. Unfortunately however the presence of the poorly known long distance contribution to $K_L \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ makes this decay less suitable for a determination of standard model parameters than $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$.

$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ could be used in particular to constrain and eventually determine V_{td} . $B^0 - \bar{B}^0$ mixing, also sensitive to V_{td} , is probably less suited for this purpose because it involves a hadronic matrix element, which is hard to calculate reliably. By contrast, no further theoretical uncertainty is present in $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ besides the residual uncertainty due to the truncation of the (RG improved) perturbation series, which illustrates the clean nature of this decay. For the determination of $|V_{td}|$ this ambiguity amounts to roughly 7%, compared to about 30% in LLA, for typical parameter values. The remaining uncertainty is almost entirely due to the charm sector.

We have also analyzed the impact of next-to-leading corrections to $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ on the determination of the parameters (ϱ, η) , relevant for the unitarity triangle. The inclusion of these corrections considerably reduces the uncertainties in (ϱ, η) present in LLA.

We remark in this context that, since the charm sector does not matter for the CP violating mode $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$, the standard model prediction in this case is extremely accurate after the inclusion of QCD corrections. In fact this decay is then

essentially free of theoretical uncertainties, which makes the challenging search for $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$ particularly desirable. Similar comments apply to $B \rightarrow X_s \nu \bar{\nu}$. For details see [15].

The residual theoretical ambiguity in $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ is much smaller than uncertainties coming from the various input parameters involved. Clearly, to be able to take advantage of the clean theoretical prediction, further progress has to be made on this side. The most important tasks for the future are the determination of the top quark mass, a more accurate determination of $|V_{cb}|$ and above all – hopefully – a measurement of $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$.

References

- [1] A.J. Buras and M.K. Harlander, A Top Quark Story, *in* Heavy Flavors, eds. A.J. Buras and M. Lindner, World Scientific (1992), p.58
- [2] L. Littenberg and G. Valencia, BNL-48631, *to appear in Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Science*, Volume 43
- [3] T. Inami and C.S Lim, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **65** (1981) 297;1772
- [4] J. Ellis and J.S. Hagelin, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 217** (1983) 189; V.A. Novikov, M.A. Shifman, A.I. Vainshtein and V.I. Zakharov, *Phys. Rev.* **D 16** (1977) 223
- [5] C.O. Dib, I. Dunietz and F.J. Gilman, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A 6** (1991) 3573
- [6] G. Buchalla, A.J. Buras and M.K. Harlander, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 349** (1991) 1; G. Buchalla, Diploma-Thesis (1990), unpublished
- [7] C.O. Dib, *Phys. Lett.* **B 282** (1992) 201
- [8] G.R. Harris and J.L. Rosner, *Phys. Rev.* **D 45** (1992) 946
- [9] D. Rein and L.M. Sehgal, *Phys. Rev.* **D 39** (1989) 3325
- [10] J.S. Hagelin and L.S. Littenberg, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **23** (1989) 1
- [11] Particle Data Group, *Phys. Rev.* **D 45** (1992), No.11 part II
- [12] M.S. Atiya et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64** (1990) 21; BNL-48066, BNL-48091, *subm. to Phys. Rev. Lett.*
- [13] Y. Kuno, KEK Preprint 92-128
- [14] G. Buchalla and A.J. Buras, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 398** (1993) 285
- [15] G. Buchalla and A.J. Buras, MPI-PTh 2-93, *to appear in Nucl. Phys. B*
- [16] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, *Phys. Rep.* **87 C** (1982) 77
- [17] S. Narison, *Phys. Lett.* **197 B** (1987) 405, **216 B** (1989) 191
- [18] A.J. Buras and P.H. Weisz, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 333** (1990) 66.

- [19] G. Altarelli, G. Curci, G. Martinelli and S. Petrarca, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 187** (1981) 461.
- [20] A.J. Buras, M. Jamin, M.E. Lautenbacher and P.H. Weisz, *Nucl.Phys.* **B 370** (1992) 69; addendum ibid. *Nucl. Phys* **B 375** (1992) 501
- [21] T. Inagaki et al., *Phys. Rev.* **D 40** (1989) 1712; C. Mathiazhagan et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **63** (1989) 2185
- [22] C.Q. Geng and J.N. Ng, *Phys. Rev.* **D 41** (1990) 2351
- [23] G. Belanger and C.Q. Geng, *Phys. Rev.* **D 43** (1991) 140
- [24] Pyungwon Ko, *Phys. Rev.* **D 45** (1992) 174

Figure Captions

- Fig. 1** The leading one-loop Z-penguin- and box diagrams inducing $\bar{s}d \rightarrow \bar{\nu}\nu$, responsible for $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu}$.
- Fig. 2** The Z-penguin in the effective theory relevant for the charm contribution (W-, Z-boson integrated out). The square blob denotes operator insertion.
- Fig. 3** Gluonic corrections to the diagrams of fig.2. Symmetric diagrams and counterterm contributions are not shown explicitly. The last diagram vanishes for massless, on-shell external quarks in dimensional regularization.
- Fig. 4** The box diagram in the effective theory.
- Fig. 5** Gluonic corrections to the diagram of fig.4.
- Fig. 6** The function X representing the charm contribution to the $\bar{s}d \rightarrow \bar{\nu}\nu$ amplitude (for $m_l = 0$) and its dependence on the renormalization scale μ_c , reflecting the theoretical uncertainty. The cases shown are: X_L (LLA), X_{NL} (NLLA) and X_0 (without QCD).
- Fig. 7** The scale dependence of the function Y , relevant for $\bar{s}d \rightarrow \bar{\mu}\mu$. We show the results in LLA, with ($\tilde{Y}_L$) and without (Y_L) non-logarithmic mass term, in NLLA (Y_{NL}) and without QCD.
- Fig. 8** $|V_{td}|$ determined from $B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu})$ as a function of $m_t = m_t(m_t)$ for fixed values of the necessary input parameters (see sect. 6). The narrow (broad) band results from a variation of the renormalization scales μ_c, μ_t in the ranges $1\text{GeV} \leq \mu_c \leq 3\text{GeV}$ and $\frac{2}{3}m_t \leq \mu_t \leq 2m_t$ in NLLA (LLA) and indicates the theoretical uncertainty involved in this analysis.
- Fig. 9** Theoretical uncertainties in the determination of the unitarity triangle in the (ϱ, η) plane from $B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu})$. For fixed parameter values the vertex of the unitarity triangle is forced to lie on a circle of radius R_b around the origin. The variation of the scales μ_c, μ_t within $1\text{GeV} \leq \mu_c \leq 3\text{GeV}$, $100\text{GeV} \leq \mu_t \leq 300\text{GeV}$ then yields the indicated ranges in LLA (full) and NLLA (reduced). We show the cases $R_b = 0.31, 0.45, 0.59$.
- Fig. 10** The scale ambiguity in $B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu})$, in analogy to fig.8.